(Departmental Library)
ಕನಾ. ಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಪತ್ರಾಗಾರ
(ಇಲಾಖಾ ಗ್ರಂಥಾಲಯ)
ಪ್ರಾಪ್ತಿ ಕ್ರಮಾಂಕ Accession No.... 4836
ದಿನಾಂಕ Date.....

MYSORE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Friday, 18th March 1966.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Vidhana Soudha, Bangalore, at Thirty Minuites past Twelve of the Clock.

MR. SPEAKER (SRI B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA, B.A., B.L.) in the Chair.

REPORT OF THE J.S.C. ON THE MYSORE SECONDARY EDUCATION EXAMINATION BOARD BILL, 1966

(*Presentation*).

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, the Education Minister may present the Joint Select Committee report.

Sri S. R. KANTHI (Minister for Education).—Sir, I beg to present the report of the Joint Select Committee on the Mysore Secondary Education Examination Board Bill, 1966.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The report of the Joint Select Committee on the Mysore Secondary Education Examination Board Bill, 1966 is presented.

Members' Representations.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ (ಹೆಬ್ಬೂರು).—ಸ್ಪಾಪಿ, ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಜಾ ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟು ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯ ಆದೇಶದಂತೆ ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಒಂದು ಮೋಷನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೆ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರ ಆದೇಶದಂತೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲೂ ಸಹ ಆಹಾರದ ನೀತಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಕೊರತೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರಾಜ್ಯಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅನುಸರಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಖಂಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not want a long speech; is it a matter of privilege or what is it?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ಹೌದು, ಅದು ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜಾಗಿದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it the same thing that the Member has written in his letter?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ಹೌದು. ಈ ಕಾಗದದ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನೇ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will look into it and he may raise the point tomorrow. Without looking into it, I cannot say anything.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರು ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿರುವ ಅತ್ಯಾಚಾರಗಳು ಹಾಗೂ ಅಟ್ರಾಸಿಟಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Can I punish anybody for it? Tomorrow I will deal with it. I will deal with it as dispassionately, as expeditiously as possible.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮೀ, ನಮ್ಮ ವಿಧಾನಪರಿಷತ್ತಿನ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಅಂಜನಪ್ಪ ನವರು ಕಾಯಿಲೆಯ ದೆಸೆಯಿಂದ ನಿನ್ನೆ ದಿನ ವಿಕ್ಟೋರಿಯಾ ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಗೆ ಹೋದಾಗ ಅವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರಕಾರ ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡ ರೀತಿ ನೀತಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭೆಯ.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is the member treating it as a matter of privilege?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ಹೌದು ಇದು ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜು. ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳು ಔಷಧಿ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does the hon. Member understand the technical meaning of the word 'privilege'? Courtesy shown, sitting, eating and all that—does it come under 'privilege'?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ಹಾಗಲ್ಲ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿ ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾದಂಥ ಮನುಷ್ಯನಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದಂತಹ ಉಪಚಾರವನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ವಿಕ್ಟೋರಿಯಾ ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದರೆ ಏನು? ಪಾವಜೆಯವರು ನಿಧನ ಹೊಂದಿದರು, ಅವರಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಔಷಧಿ ಉಪಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡ ಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗಾದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಏನಾದರೂ ಇದೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬ ಭಾವನೆ ನಮಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ. ನೆನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ 4 ಗಂಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಕ್ಟೋರಿಯಾ ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಗೆ ಅಂಜನಪ್ಪನವರು ಅಡ್ಮಿಟ್ ಆದರು, ರಾತ್ರಿ 9 ಗಂಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು, ಅಂದಾನಯ್ಯನವರು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾಗ ಒಬ್ಬ ಡಾಕ್ಟರು ಕುಡಿದು, ಮತ್ತರಾಗಿ ಅಂಜನಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೆ ಶುಶ್ರೂಷೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ರೀತಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅದು ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯ ಪೈಶಾಚಿಕ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇತ್ತು. ಮತ್ತು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಒದಗಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕೊಠಡಿ, ಅಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ರೀತಿನೀತಿ, ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ, ನೀರು, ಫ್ಯಾನು, ಗಾಳಿ ಯಾವುದೂ ಕೂಡ ಇಲ್ಲದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವ್ಯವಸ್ಥಿತವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ವಿಧಾನ ಪರಿಷತ್ತಿನ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕತಕ್ಕ ಔಷಧೋಪಚಾರ ಕೂಡ ಸಿಕ್ಕದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ನನ್ನಿವೇಶವನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಇನ್ನು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಔಷಧಿಗಳು ದೊರೆತು ಅವರ ಪ್ರಾಣಗಳನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಇದೆಯೇ? ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮೂಲಭೂತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹಕ್ಕುಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗೆ ಚ್ಯುತಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಹಕ್ಕುಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಯ ಸಮಿತಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do desire that members must have a clear grip of what they are saying, How many times has the member said 'mulabhuta'? Am I dealing with fundamental rights here? If it is a privilege under the provisions of the Constitution, then it is a matter which I will have to enquire and then come to a conclusion. I do not want to give a ruling just now at this stage. I did not want to disturb the hon'ble member though I tried to cut short by asking him "are you convinced that it is a privilege?" The member may be entitled to certain treatment and other facilities in the hospital, but does it become a privilege in regard to the transaction of the business on tha Floor of the House to be brought here and to be entertained by me as a privilege question without examining it. If it is to be accepted as a privilege question I must first be convinced that it is prima facie a matter of privilege of the House and therefore it must be referred to the Privileges Committee. Members must have a little patience and give time to me to examine it. In fact, it has come to me now and I am going to enquire into it. Members have no patience even to wait. I have no objection to its being taken up tomorrow, but I must first be convinced that it is a matter of privilege. Is the member discharging his duty as a member of the House in the hospital, is there any House in the hospital or is there any motion there? If there is anything like that in support of the privilege question, he may tell me. I am keeping my

mind open. I will look into it. I am gathering facts. How can I give a decision ex parte, without even holding an enquiry simply because the member insists ? Is that reasonable ? I am trying to gather facts and understand them. There must be a certain amount of study behind it to come to a decision whether it is worthy of acceptance or not. Let him not be in a hurry simply because when he says something here, it will come in the Press tomorrow. That is not correct.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—It is a question of treatment that the authorities have given to a member.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not yet convinced that it is a matter to be raised on the floor of the House. The medical treatment of a member in the hospital cannot be a privilege question on the floor of the House,

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Sira).—We have no objection to your examining whether it has all the ingredients for admission as a question of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have not yet looked into it. I want to gather all the facts, study them and then give my decision.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—You were observing that we are here for publicity. That is not correct, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I did not say so. I said, why rush to make a statement here without even a study of all the facts.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—My friend Sri Lakkappa raised another point about a police officer just handling the member in a certain manner.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That will come up tomorrow. Should I not gather facts ? Am I to condemn anybody without any enquiry ? I did not make the same observation as I made with regard to the question of medical treatment. I said I will enquire into it. Does anybody suggest that I should ex-parte without any enquiry hang him ?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—We are not here to compel the Speaker to take an immediate and hasty decision. We want that your decision should not go wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then wait till tomorrow. Let us go slow, steady, in a cool, calculated and determined way.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ತೀರ್ಥಹಳ್ಳಿ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಪಡೆದು ಒಂದು ತ್ವರಿತವಾದ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯತೆಯ ವಿಷಯದತ್ತ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನವನ್ನು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೆಳೆದು .....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let not the Member refer to the contents.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಎರಡು ವಾಕ್ಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ ಬಿಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲ, ನಾನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಸೂಚನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅದರ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಇದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Member has given notice of a resolution for adjourning the work of the House for discussing the matter relating to food. I am calling upon the Minister for Food to ascertain what exactly the position is, because before I deal with it I must know the latest position. Therefore, I am passing it on to the Minister for Food. The Minister for Food will look into it and tell me what the position is and then I will deal with it.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister for Food).—That can be taken up even today at any time after 4-00 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—After the Education Demand is over before the next Demand is taken up, you can kindly give me a statement and I will deal with it after the Demand is over.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ತಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಕೃತಜ್ಞನಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಕೆಲವು ವಾಕ್ಯಗಳನ್ನಾದರೂ ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಅವಶ್ಯಕ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗಲ್ಲ, ನಾಲ್ಕು ಗಂಟೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ. If the Member wants it to be taken up just now without ascertaining the position, I am unable to accept it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನಾದರೂ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ನನಗೆ ಅನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will give the Member a chance after the Education Demand is over. But if he wants to speak now alone, then it means that I am not here regulating the House but the Member is regulating. I cannot allow that.

Now the Minister for Education will reply.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಬೈರಪ್ಪಾಜಿ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಆಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅವಮಾನ.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have dealt with it just now. Simply because the member gets up, does the member mean to say that I am going to reviveit ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಬೈರಪ್ಪಾಜಿ.—ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not going to allow anybody. What does he mean by "Avakasa"? Does it mean that everybody should speak? Now the Minister for Education will begin.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—I rise to a point of order. Rule 32 of the Rules of Procedure lays down that the first hour of every day shall be devoted for Questions and Answers.

Sir, you have got enormous powers and discretions. If the members have tabled questions and if the answers are ready, why is it that the Government are not sending them ? The Government is not behaving properly. Will the Speaker direct the Government to see that proper justice is done to the questions that have been tabled by the members. Rule 32 will be of no avail. They have protection and you have the discretionary powers.

Mr. SPEAKER.—When the work of the House is to begin, to raise points of order or this type which are no points of order at all is not correct. I have always said that the members must tell me beforehand and if they do not choose to tell me and if ever I have allowed them, it is more out of discretion, courtesy and affection to the members. If they are not going to appreciate that, all that I can say is that I will regidly say that no member should say anything which is not in the agenda. I am trying to accommodate them. If members think that they are entitled to get up and say anything on a matter which is posted for

tomorrow, I cannot allow that. Simply because one member gets up and says that Mr. Lakkappa has been insulted and then to raise a privilege issue on that matter is not proper. That matter has been fully dealt with by me and adjourned for tomorrow.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಬೈರಪ್ಪಾಜಿ.—ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯವಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈಗಲೇ ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥ ವಾಗಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not going to do that. The House has adjourned it and I have adjourned it and now to say that is dictation. The Hon'ble Member seems to think that he has a right to say what business should be transacted by the Speaker. If this is allowed, I do not know what is going to happen. Members must co-operate with the Chair. A letter has been given and I cannot give a decision ex-parte. I am making enquiries. I have a little information; it is not complete. The matter has been placed before me and if members do not co-operate.....What is the special point in taking it up now?

Now, a point of order has been raised by the Hon'ble Member Sri Lakkappa. He did not point out any rule which is violated. He referred to Rule 32 and he further said that the Speaker has got the discretion to omit questions if the exigencies of the situation require it. It is not a matter which has arisen suddenly today. The omission of questions in the agenda was a step which was decided yesterday. If the member had been present, he would have know it. If he was present and had known it, he should not have raised this point of order. His ignorance on account of his absence does not change the situation to any extent whatsoever. Apart from that, if the Speaker has exercised his discretion vested in him under the Rules, there is no point of order. I am really surprised that the member has raised it after I have called the Hon'ble Education Minister to reply. There is no merit in the point of order and I am unable to accept it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ (ತಿಪಟೂರು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ತಮ್ಮ.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order. I have called upon the Minister to reply. I could have finished this demand yesterday itself without accommodating the members.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನನ್ನದೊಂದು ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಇದೆ ಕಳೆದ ನಾಲ್ಕೂವರೆ ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅತಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೋತ್ತರಗಳ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is the rule?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪುಸ್ತಕ ನೋಡಿ, ಸ್ವಾಮಿ. ಅದರಲ್ಲೇ ಇದೆ. ಅತಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೋತ್ತರಗಳ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನು?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The point of order is rejected. If it adds grace and stature to the House, let it be recorded for the future generations to read. After all the distrubance that has happened in the House, yet another Hon'ble Member Sri Revanasiddappa has raised a point of order. When asked to point out the rule which has been violated, he wanted me to refer to the Book itself. This is surprising statement to be made by any member. On the floor of the House, to ask the Chair to refer to

(MR. SPEAKER)

the whole book without mentioning the rule—he is assuming too much. Every member knows what he has said; perhaps he might have said it inadvertently. I am prepared to take it that he has said it without any malafides. He will take note of it and see that he does not repeat such language.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—We are very peaceful and democratic when compared to other Legislatures.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Which Legislature the Hon'ble Member has in mind, I do not know. If he thinks that he is going to raise his status by repeating what has happened elsewhere, let him think over and do what he pleases. If anything happens I have only to deal with it.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—If the Government provokes and if it is responsible for creating all these things.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Who is provoking whom? Order, order.

Sri A. KRISHNA SHETTY (Mangalore-II).—Is it any case that you are preparing against us, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Kindly explain against whom, before whom and for what purpose.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—After all, it is a very small matter.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ಧಪ್ಪ.—ಜನರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡೋಣ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the Member does not want the reply, let us not have it.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—It was announced that there are only 9 questions which need not be taken up today and that we should go on with the Education Demand. We are not going to question the decision we have taken yesterday. For these small matters there need not be so much commotion.

1-00 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question of having the interpellation on a particular day is covered by the rules. There is no rule that is violated. Whed asked to cite the rule the Hon'ble Member did not cite the rule but he asked me to refer to the book containing the rule. His later explanation is that during the tenure of this Legislature the largest number of hours have been spent without Questions on the respective days. I am unable to accept it for more reasons than one. If any interpellations were not taken up on any particular day it was a matter which has been mentioned to this House, consent or concurrence of the House has been taken, expressed or implied and on that interpellations have not been included in the agenda and the work has been transacted. No objection as this been raised at any time. It is absolutely inconsistent to say the least of it. I find there is no merit in the point of order.

One or two more points have been raised by one of the Hon'ble Members on which a ruling has not been delivered. I wanted to deliver the ruling without impairing the utility of other works a couple of days back. The point that was raised, while discussing the demands, the cut motions were not moved and were not voted upon. Sri Gopala Gowda was asked to look into the matter in detail and I had supplied him a list of relevant books. So far as this question is concerned, one or two particular decisions or rulings of this House were also mentioned to him. The procedure that has been followed in this House is well known and is perfectly proper. It is seen recorded in the proceedings of this House. A reference for the past several years will go to show that cut motions have not been moved. The Demands have been put to vote and voted upon. In olden times when plenty of time was available, every cut motion was being taken, debated upon and voted upon and finally the demands were voted upon. Such procedures was found to be cumbersome in several legislatures and hence this procedure has not been adhered to. There is a difference on more than one account between the procedure followed in England so far as the financial statements or what has been taken here as Budget, and the procedure followed in India. So far as the Mysore Legislature is concerned, the rulings given by my learned predecessor Sri S. R. Kanthi as early as 1958 have covered this point in detail.

If Sri Gopala Gowda wants to say anything in the matter he may do so.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ಎತ್ತಿದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ನಮ್ಮ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ನಂಬರು 165,(ಎ) (ಬಿ) (ಸಿ) 166, 167, 168 ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೇವಲ ಹಿಂದೆ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಂಥ ಒಂದು ರೂಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಸಮಯ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ದೊರೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಖೋತಾ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಮತಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಿ ನಂತರ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾಲ ಹಿಡಿಯುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ಖೋತಾ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಇದ್ದಂಥ ಪ್ರಾಶಸ್ತ್ಯ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ಸಲ ಯಾವ ಖೋತಾ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಯಾವ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಲೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಮಂಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ದೊರೆಯಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಇದನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದು ಇದು ಬಹುಶಃ ಕ್ರಮಬದ್ಧವಾದ ಮಾರ್ಗವಲ್ಲ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಆನು ನರಿಸುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಕಟ್ ಮೋನ್ಸ್ ಇರಬೇಕು, ಹೇಗೆ ಮಂಡಿಸ ಬೇಕು ಎಷ್ಟು ಹೊತ್ತು ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಬೇಕು, ಮತಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವಾಗ ಹೇಗೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು ಇದನೆಲ್ಲಾ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡ ಬೇಕು. ನದನ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದರೆ ಆಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸುವುದು ಸಾಧ್ಯ. ಈಗ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ನಂಬರು 166, 167, 168, 169 ಈ ವಿಧಿಗಳು ಈಗ ಅನುಸರಿಸತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ತಾವು ಕಳಿಸಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಂಥ ಪುಸ್ತಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಖೋತಾ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ 1880 ನೆ ಇಸವಿ ಲಾಗಾಯ್ತು ಪರಂಪರೆ ಏನು ಈ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ, ಪಾರ್ಲಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ, ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಅವಲೋಕಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿ ಒತ್ತಾಯಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟ ಪಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಾರಣವೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಈ ಆಯವ್ಯಯ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಖೋತಾ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಾರದೆ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಲ್ಯಾಪ್ಸ್ ಆಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಾಡಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ವರ್ತಿಸಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಒತ್ತಾಯ

† Indicates that the remarks or speeches have not been revised by the member concerned.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ)

ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಿ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಬಹುಶಃ ಈ ಖೋತಾ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳ ಭವಿಷ್ಯ ಏನು ಆಗಿರಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯವಾದೀತು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member has left the matter unprecise.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ಕನ್ನಡ ಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ನಾನು ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟಪಟ್ಟು ಶಬ್ದ ಪ್ರಯೋಗ ಮಾಡಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾನು ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದಾಗ ತಮಗೆ ನಾನು ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಅನ್-ಪ್ರಿಸೈಸ್ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ ಎಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ಭಾವನೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷನಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ತಮಗೆ ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷ್ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಏನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ನಂಧಿಗ್ಧ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಉದ್ಭವಿಸುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶಿಮಠ (ಶಿರಹಟ್ಟಿ).—ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ನಾವು ಕಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್ಸ್ ಕಳಿಸಿದ್ದೆವು. ಆದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಲೀ, ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಲೀ, ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡದಿದ್ದರೆ. ಅದರ ಬೆಲೆ ಉಳಿಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ತರಹ ನಿಗ ಕೊಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ನಮಗೆ ಕಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್‌ನಿಂದ ಯಾವ ಉಪಯೋಗವು ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಓಟು ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—In the present Session, sometime back you were pleased to observe that conventions can be over-ruled by rules of procedure which is adopted in this House. If you just make a difference between a convention and the rules, I think there the conflict arises. Whether it was a ruling given by your predecessor or the House agreed to this Convention, we want to know. If it is not a convention, we accept that it is a ruling. The objection raised by my friend Sri Gopal Gowda is quite correct. Since we are not amending rules 160 to 168, I do not think any conventions can prevail, over-riding the Rules of Procedure, to go on with the business of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I suppose there is nothing more to be added.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—You were pleased to quote from that big book what your predecessor has said. Is it agreed upon ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Member has made his speech and I will deal with it.

I mentioned that the Hon. Member Sri Gopal Gowda, who raised the point, left the matters unprecise. He feels that he has been very precise and that the defect has arisen on account of his using the Kannada language, which perhaps does not yield to him proper expressions. I am not going into the fine shades of it or the facets which are minor. The question is whether this House in fixing business with regard to the Demands regarding which notice of cut-motions have come, is following the correct procedure or not.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಈ ವಿಧಾನಗಳು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಾವು ಅವುಗಳನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡದೆ, ನಾವು, ಒಪ್ಪದೆ ಈ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದು ಬಹುಶಃ ಕ್ರಮತಪ್ಪಿಸಿ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದವೇ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನೆರ್ಲಾ ಬರೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA.—I feel that unless the relevant clauses with regard to the Cut Motions, namely Rules 165, 166, 167 and 168, are properly amended, I think the procedure that is being adopted now with regard to the Cut Motions is not proper; I think it is not in order. I would like to have a ruling on this question, that too a considered ruling, which may improve your predecessor's ruling and also give some scope in future for the provisions to function in an effective manner because, Mr. Speaker, Sir, you are well aware that the cut motions have their own historical background, and that is the only way a Government can be impeached or a Government can be censured and the policy matters discussed. With regard to the Demands, I would very much like you to consider again unless if you have already come to some conclusions saying that the procedure we have adopted hitherto is in order and proper. And that should be the way in which the cut motions should be dealt with. Then, I think we will doing great injustice so far as the cut motions are concerned. Am I clear?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, the Hon. Member Sri Gopal Gowda has explained himself in explicit, unequivocal, clear terms what he wanted to convey. Understanding all that, as he has mentioned, I am yet unable to agree with what he has stated. He wants me to study further even if I have come to a conclusion. I do not think, it will be necessary. But if it is the desire of this particular Member or any other Member, I am prepared to study further and give a condsidered ruling.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—After some time.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is the matter with some of the Members today?

And I do so not only for that reason which is good enough but for some other reason that I am carrying the other work of the House. Therefore, I now call upon the Hon'ble Minister for Education to begin his reply.

BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1966-67—DEMANDS FOR GRANTS

DEMAND NOS. 17, 37 AND 49

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಕಂಠಿ.— ನನ್ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, 2 ದಿವಸಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಸನ್ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅತ್ಯಂತ ಋಣಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಹಲವರು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಸೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕೆಲವರು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕೋಪವನ್ನು ವಿಶ್ರಮಾಡಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕೆಲವರು ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗೆ ಅಭಿಮಾನವಾಗುವ ರೀತಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಯಾವುದೂ ಕೋಪ ನನಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. 4 ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕಾಲವಾಯಿತು ನಾನು ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಶಾಖೆಯನ್ನು ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು. ಈ 4 ವರ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕ, ಯಾವುದನ್ನು ಬಿಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದರಬಗ್ಗೆ ನನಗೆ ನಿಖರವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ 4 ವರ್ಷದ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಯೋಗ್ಯವಾದುದನ್ನೇ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಯೋಗ್ಯವಾದುದನ್ನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಮಾಡಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.